	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/923,626	BONAKDAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sabiha Qazi	1616
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Sabiha Qazi</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Aaron Ettelman</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 March 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: USC 103		
Claims discussed: 1-19		
Prior art documents discussed: HUNT et al		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
		j
		,
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Attorney Aaron Ettelman to discuss the term "mild" in claim 1 and the differences between the instant invention and the prior art. Mr. Ettelman argued that the differences mainly lie in the "mild" conditions at step b in claim 1. The Examiner referred to the definition of "mild" in the Specification, where it is not patentably specific. The Examiner suggested that the Applicants amend the claims to make them more specific. Unfortunately, no agreement was reached..